

How does this strike you?

Every dollar guaranteed by a \$300,000 American Corporation

\$250 monthly life income to you when you need it most.

\$250 monthly life income to your wife when she needs it most.

\$50,000 face of guaranteed bond to your children to put them through college or start them off in business or married life.

You pay for this 6% - \$30,000 Bond in installments of about \$1,800 a year—depending on yours and your wife's ages. Your first annual payment puts the Bond in your safe deposit box.

Full details on request

William S. Blizzard
115 Broadway, New York

Telephone RECTOR 4427

TO TURN OVER ALL SHIP LIQUOR TO-DAY

General Manager of U. S. Lines Says He Expects to Surrender Stocks.

PROTEST DRY RULING

British Visitors Question Our Right to Regulate Foreign Vessels.

BOATS COME IN WET

Passengers Say No Special Attention Has Been Paid to Daugherty Order.

Thomas H. Rosbottom, general manager of the United States Lines, said he expected to turn over to the authorized representative of the Treasury Department to-day all the liquor, wine and beer now on board his ships, including the President Polk, which sails Wednesday, and the President Arthur, which arrived yesterday.

In spite of the warning sent to all American ships at sea to close their bars, following the publication of the ruling, the President Arthur did not close her bar until the three mile limit was reached, according to her passengers. Customs officials who received the ship at her pier, No. 4, Hoboken, said they had no instructions to seize the liquor on board.

The 225 passengers had consumed 2,200 liters of beer on the trip—about fifty-one kegs—and there was very little hard liquor left, the officers said. They also said if the ruling is enforced it probably would result in all the crew becoming bootleggers and getting drunk most of the time on the kind of stuff bootleggers sell.

Can't Prevent Bootlegging.

It would be impossible to police the ships so as to prevent bootlegging, they said. This was also the opinion of the officials of the United States lines. Mr. Rosbottom said he had sent a wireless to the America, which sailed Saturday, not to restock at Bremen, where she has taken on her wet cargo on other trips.

If foreign ships are not permitted to have liquor on board when they touch at American ports, Mr. Rosbottom thought, it may be possible for the Americans to compete, but otherwise the order will knock out our trade, especially with Bremen and Hamburg next spring. Speculation was general as to what will become of the winter "world tour," two of which have been arranged by American ships, the Resolute and the Reliance. It was agreed that a world tour on a dry ship would not be a financial success from the standpoint of the steamship company.

Four other world, South American and West Indian tours are scheduled for foreign companies. These will probably arrange to start from Halifax or Montreal in order to avoid complications, it was thought.

British Protest Ruling.

Sir Arthur Adlington Roworth, chairman of the Manchester Royal Exchange and a member of the Sulgrave delegation, which returned to New York yesterday after a tour of the South and middle West, expressed great concern when told that the ruling of Attorney-General Daugherty prohibiting liquor on American ships also applied to foreign shipping which enters American ports with liquor on board as cargo or in stores, or even in a sealed bar.

Americans have a complete right to legislate for themselves in any way they choose, said Sir Arthur. But when they propose to regulate British, French, Italian and Japanese shipping, "that is a different thing."

"This ruling will call for considerable debate," declared Sir Arthur. He expressed the conviction, however, that "the spirit of frankness in arbitration which has been established between Great Britain and America in past controversies will make the danger of serious complication, which would have been imminent fifty years ago, practically nil in this instance."

Questions Legality of Ruling.

"Both the Constitution and international law are concerned in this opinion of your Attorney-General," stated Sir Arthur. "I assume that he knows what he is doing, though it appears to me that he would have to derive special authority from Congress for such action as he has taken. As for the problems in international law involved in the case I cannot give an authoritative opinion. I'm not a lawyer; I'm a business man." When asked if the enforcement of this new dry regulation would drive transatlantic travel away from New York to Halifax or Montreal, Sir Arthur replied with an emphatic negative.

"There will be no serious diversion of travel," he declared. "People are not going to be landed hundreds of miles out of their way for the sake of a drink. Mr. Harry S. Perris, director of the British Sulgrave Institution, had not heard of the Attorney-General's ruling until informed of its nature by a New York Herald reporter.

"I should first of course question its validity," Mr. Perris said. Mr. Perris refused to comment specifically on the possible influence of the ruling upon shipping interests or on international relations. He pointed out, however, in connection with American efforts to enforce prohibition the unfortunate rigidity of our constitutional amendments. "I certainly feel that while we can learn from you in many things that you could learn from us in flexibility of law making. We have much greater adaptability to changing conditions. We do not lay down the law for ourselves as though it were something sacred and unchangeable. I should gladly support prohibition in England myself if I thought it would be possible to deprive the liquor interests of their political power and elevate the working classes without imposing oppressive regulations upon the whole body of the people. We will never have such a drastic law as yours," Mr. Perris declared.

RECREATION CONGRESS OPENS.

ATLANTIC CITY, Oct. 8.—The National Recreation Congress opens its convention here to-day at Chalfonte-Haddon Hall to discuss community recreation in all its phases. Among the speakers will be Arthur Pound, Lorado Taft, Prof. George P. Baker of Harvard and Dr. John H. Finley.

FRENCH LINE WILL OBSERVE LIQUOR RULING IF UPHELD

Until Definite Understanding Is Reached Ships Will Seal Intoxicants at the Three Mile Line, but Will Not Be Diverted to Canadian Ports.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK HERALD, Copyright, 1922, by THE NEW YORK HERALD. New York Herald Bureau, Oct. 8.

If United States Attorney-General Daugherty's order prohibiting ships with bars from entering American ports is to have full force of law the French Line still will operate between Havre and Cherbourg and New York, conforming with American demands. But until the question is studied and reports are received from the company's American agents the Compagnie Generale Transatlantique will continue sending ships with the usual complement of liquor aboard, to be sealed up when the three mile limit is reached.

This preliminary program was announced to THE NEW YORK HERALD correspondent this afternoon by President Dalpiaz of the French Line from his country home just outside Paris, the correspondent giving to him the first intimation that any such radical interference with shipping affairs was contemplated by the American authorities.

It comes as a great surprise, and it is hard to believe that M. Daugherty's decision is really legal," he said. "That aspect of the situation must be studied immediately, of course, and we shall ask for the fullest information immediately from our agents in New York. But it is ridiculous to suggest that companies will change ports of embarkation on account of the ruling. I am certain that my company will not make Montreal or any Canadian port the substitute for New York, and it is doubtful that others will."

"If the decision stands there is only one thing to do and that is to conform as nearly as possible to American laws and leave the future to public opinion."

Dispatches to THE NEW YORK HERALD from Paris today said that hotel bars throughout the city to-day, by the majority who read refused to take the

LASKER SAYS FOREIGN LINES WILL MAKE DRY RULE FUTILE

Continued from First Page.

profit in the north Atlantic trade unless you get your share of the immigrant traffic. Your immigrant is almost invariably a wine drinker and he is not going to travel on any ship that denies him the facilities of his daily life."

"From the international standpoint it ought to be remembered that the States which adopted prohibition found it worse than ineffective and it became necessary to amend the prohibition law applying to the forty-eight States of the Union equally. I am convinced that any ruling applied to liquor on the sea cannot be made effective until there has been an international agreement binding on all nations."

Would Not Blame Foreign Nation.

"We have a right of course to say that our own ships must carry liquor, but I do not blame foreign nations if they protest vigorously and threaten us with retaliation."

"As far as we ourselves are concerned all I am going to do is to give the shadow of prohibition as against the substance of an American merchant marine."

"I expect the next move of the foreign shipping interests will be to get an injunction against whatever regulations are issued in accordance with the rulings of the Attorney-General. How long it will be in the courts no one can tell, but meantime I know that foreign ships will go on as they have been going on."

"Our next move should be to pass the ship subside legislation, which will give compensation for the loss this imposes on our ships and at the same time will embody a provision which would give American ships 50 per cent. of the immigrant trade, although this necessitates renouncing sections of existing treaties."

"In saying all of this I am not questioning the legality of the ruling of the Attorney-General. I am not speaking in regard to the prohibition. I am merely insisting on the extent of the blow it gives the American merchant marine, while I am sure that foreign countries will in one way or another be able to get liquor."

Mr. Wheeler's Comment.

Wayne B. Wheeler, legal as well as political spokesman here for the Anti-Saloon League, has indicated that he will not stop at the Daugherty decision. He thinks the United States should extend its control of the liquor traffic beyond the three mile limit if that seems necessary to make the nation dry.

"I expected nothing else from the Attorney-General," said he. "He read the laws of the land correctly and his interpretation is just what it should have been. His opinion is supported by good reason and sound law. It will make law enforcement easier. I made the contention in my brief that under the statute United States and foreign ships could not transport intoxicating liquors within the three mile limit."

"The present status of liquor beyond the three mile limit is uncertain. For certain purposes existing law extends the limit to twelve miles and the courts have sustained it. This we hold applies to liquor. But Great Britain has protested and the matter is in abeyance until a final decision on the points at issue is reached."

"My contention, and I believe it will be sustained, is that reason and precedent indicate that any nation may extend the limit of jurisdiction beyond the three mile limit to protect itself from rum smugglers and others who violate organic and statutory laws. Practically all nations have enacted such laws. If there be any doubt that the laws we have are not sufficient then others should be enacted."

The Anti-Saloon League and similar dry organizations are ready to move further in this controversy. They point to the decision of a Supreme Court holding that liquors, the manufacture and sale of which are prohibited by United States laws, cannot be shipped through this country to foreign lands. The court held that it was illegal to transfer intoxicants from ship to ship conveying it from one foreign country to another. It is contended by the prohibitionists that this ruling of the court indicates what will happen when the Daugherty opinion reaches there.

Expects Daugherty to Be Upheld.

"I believe that the Supreme Court will affirm the decision of the Attorney-General," declared Mr. Wheeler. "Former rulings plainly pave the way for that."

The far reaching court opinion cited by the drys was handed down May 15. A majority of the court held that intoxicating liquor cannot be shipped through the United States; that includes the three mile limit as well as on land, the drys assert.

Justices Day, McKenna and Clarke dissented from this view. They said the United States should not try to impose its will upon the whole world with respect to alcohol.

This decision was made in the case

question seriously, believing that the Supreme Court certainly would upset the Attorney-General's edict.

"It seems the United States Government is trying to prove it is master of the seas by interfering with sailing matters, which is likely to provoke trouble abroad," declared E. L. Wright, a Philadelphia attorney, "I doubt whether any court ever will uphold Mr. Daugherty in this stand."

In commenting upon the decision Judge Walter V. Berry, president of the American Chamber of Commerce in Paris, epitomized the situation thus: "Prohibition to-day has reached the delirium tremens stage. Certainly Mr. Daugherty's decision is regrettable from the standpoint of the feeling it is likely to provoke, but I do not consider it will have any effect upon commerce. Even should some companies divert their liners to Canada, goods bound for America would be merely delayed slightly, but the customs income still would not be affected. In the latter case, however, it would be a serious loss for the port of New York, not only from the labor standpoint but due to the fact that New York's statistics, which are a vital factor in keeping up the city's prestige, would show a material falling off."

Mingled with the more serious consideration of the question, however, the decision is arousing many ironical comments from passengers who declare that the law can't prevent America bound voyagers having a final drink aboard outside the three mile limit, as it is an easy matter to store a sufficient wine reserve in a water-tight tin across the Atlantic. One intrepid seafarer caustically asked why the American law doesn't go a step further and insist that passengers be not allowed to land unless they present a certificate showing they have attended and Captain's Roosevelt faithfully and reverently during the week.

Supreme Court Decisions.

Mr. Daugherty cites three decisions by the Supreme Court as of general public interest. In the case against Rose Ygnorovich on an appeal from the District Court for the Eastern District of Washington he said:

"In passing on an amendment charging the production of liquor for beverage purposes in violation of certain sections of the revised statutes the court held that Congress did not intend to preserve the penalties theretofore existing in addition to the specific provisions made for punishment of the Volstead act."

In the case of Dillon vs. Gloss, brought up from California, the Supreme Court held that "proposals and ratification of amendments to the Constitution are not unrelated acts but succeeding steps in a single endeavor, so that a fair implication that ratification is to be had within a reasonable time and that fixing a definite period within which ratification must be had, was within the provision of Congress."

This has been a moot question. In the case of Street vs. Lincoln Safe Deposit Company, brought up from New York, the Supreme Court held "that liquors lawfully acquired before the effective date of the national prohibition act might be kept in a room in private storage warehouses when the owner had exclusive possession and control of the room and removed therefrom, by him and transported under permit from the Bureau of Internal Revenue to his dwelling for consumption by himself and family or bona friends."

This opinion was considered a slight blow at the prohibitionists who had been trying to prevent the transfer of such liquors.

SACRED GOLD FEEDS HUNGRY.

Soviet Applies Church Seizures to Famine Relief.
Moscow, Oct. 8.—Five hundred pounds of gold and 2,500 pounds of silver, part of the accumulation by the Soviet Government from confiscation of church treasures, have been transferred by the commissariat of finance to the central committee of famine relief, according to official announcement.

All this metal and more, it is stated, is to be converted into cash for the purchase abroad of supplies for the hungry of Russia. The first cash realized by the sale of church gold and silver was expended in Finland for food some months ago.

Baltimore American—So far as the order affects American ships, the action of the Attorney-General would appear logical, convincing and legal. But difficulties of the most acute nature are very likely to result. England, for example, is most jealous of her international rights. She has a hewn of standing by her nationals. She is a stickler for English freedom of the seas, whether or not she is a stickler for the general principle. It is hard to imagine British compliance with the American attitude.

Baltimore Sun—From the purely domestic viewpoint the Daugherty "opinion" is a perfectly logical step in the chain of development initiated by the Eighteenth Amendment. Another logical step, which now no longer seems fantastic, would be to build a Chinese wall around the coast of America, admitting its gates only those firmly committed to absolute prohibition.

Boston Herald—This opinion over-

rules Chairman Lasker and his policy of putting American ships on a competitive basis with those of other nations. It makes more difficult the problem of keeping American passenger ships on the North Atlantic lanes. It serves notice on the world that the United States is in earnest in its prohibition experiment and that no call has yet been sounded for the beating of a retreat.

Providence Journal—Of course the Attorney-General and President will be subjected to criticism for the new situation, but they have taken the only position that has appeared to them to be sound, the law being what it is; and the overwhelming majority of their fellow citizens, whatever their personal inclination toward prohibition may be, must be expected to agree with them.

Chicago Tribune—The purpose of our prohibition amendment is simple and clear. It was adopted to stop production, consumption and trade in alcoholic beverages within United States territory. Not even the most rabid prohibitionist intended that the amendment should be made to apply to the high seas or to the people of other nations, not prohibitionists, traveling on the high seas. Yet the Daugherty ruling extends it to such application.

HALIFAX SHIPPING MEN DON'T EXPECT DIVERSION.

Special Dispatch to THE NEW YORK HERALD, HALIFAX, N. S., Oct. 8.—Opinion among shipping men in Halifax is divided as to the probable effect upon the commerce of this port of Attorney-General Daugherty's decision with regard to liquor on transatlantic passenger ships.

While the hope is expressed that this may mean a diversion of traffic from United States ports to Canadian, as feared by Chairman Lasker of the United States Shipping Board, it is nevertheless felt that the steamship lines sailing directly from European to American ports will be able to find a way of circumventing the ruling without recourse to the circuitous method of touching at Canadian ports for the purpose of unloading liquor in bond prior to entering the prohibition zone.

Taken in conjunction with the recent decision of the United States Government to restrict its dry activities to its own territorial waters with respect to vessels under foreign registry, the enforcement of Attorney-General Daugherty's opinion can be evaded, say local shipping men, without steamship lines being compelled to incur the additional expense of protracting their transatlantic voyage to put in at Canadian ports, pay added harbor dues and pilotage, to say nothing of purchasing such stores and fuel as would be necessary to accommodate them for the twenty-four or thirty-six hours by which the voyage under such circumstances would be lengthened.

EDITORS CONDEMN DAUGHERTY ORDER

Newspaper Comment Calls New Sea Liquor Rule All Too Sweeping.

LOOK TO HIGH COURT

Hope Expressed That Some Way Will Be Found for Change.

BRITISH PROTEST SEEN

One Opinion Is That She Will Show Habit of Upholding Nationals.

Editorial opinion from American newspapers on the new sea liquor ruling follows:

Philadelphia Record—The prescription, not only as a beverage but as a subject of transportation of a commodity that in all countries and all ages has been as much an article of diet as bread, is hardly more revolutionary than a good many persons imagined. We are not getting rid of drunkenness, but we are daily finding new resources in our vast population of interference with commerce and with the habits of the vast majority who used wine and its substitutes as sanely as Theodore Roosevelt and all our other Presidents have done.

Philadelphia Bulletin—In its extension of the underlying principle so as to prohibit possession of liquor within the three mile limit by foreign ships, the decision is undoubtedly drastic, but it is indicated will not be given practical effect until the question has been passed on by the Supreme Court. Its enforcement in regard to foreign vessels would create special difficulties and occasion for friction not present in the case of American ships and in the end many foreign ships would presumably resort to arbitrary expedients and their wet in any case beyond the three mile limit.

Philadelphia Evening Ledger—The decision of Attorney-General Daugherty that the sale of any intoxicating liquor on American ships is illegal will appear in the eyes of the more zealous prohibitionists as a great moral victory for their cause and the principle one which it is founded. It may be all of that, and even more, but for the present it is enough to say that the decision, whatever its moral effects and implications may be, will be received with something like jubilation in those countries, which, once dominant on the seas, have more recently been viewing with great concern the growth of the new American merchant marine.

Philadelphia Public Ledger—The very sweeping opinion of Attorney-General Daugherty prohibiting liquor on American ships, had to come. We were making a mockery of ourselves at home and a figure of ridicule abroad by permitting the peddling of booze on our ships while trying to outlaw it at home. Some such opinion as this has been inevitable since the day the Eighteenth Amendment was ratified. It is nobody's business but our own what we do in our own territory, and on our own ships in enforcement of prohibition. It does seem, however, that the opinion of Attorney-General Daugherty and the action of President Harding in regard to foreign vessels in American ports are too sweeping.

Baltimore American—So far as the order affects American ships, the action of the Attorney-General would appear logical, convincing and legal. But difficulties of the most acute nature are very likely to result. England, for example, is most jealous of her international rights. She has a hewn of standing by her nationals. She is a stickler for English freedom of the seas, whether or not she is a stickler for the general principle. It is hard to imagine British compliance with the American attitude.

Baltimore Sun—From the purely domestic viewpoint the Daugherty "opinion" is a perfectly logical step in the chain of development initiated by the Eighteenth Amendment. Another logical step, which now no longer seems fantastic, would be to build a Chinese wall around the coast of America, admitting its gates only those firmly committed to absolute prohibition.

Boston Herald—This opinion over-

rules Chairman Lasker and his policy of putting American ships on a competitive basis with those of other nations. It makes more difficult the problem of keeping American passenger ships on the North Atlantic lanes. It serves notice on the world that the United States is in earnest in its prohibition experiment and that no call has yet been sounded for the beating of a retreat.

Providence Journal—Of course the Attorney-General and President will be subjected to criticism for the new situation, but they have taken the only position that has appeared to them to be sound, the law being what it is; and the overwhelming majority of their fellow citizens, whatever their personal inclination toward prohibition may be, must be expected to agree with them.

Chicago Tribune—The purpose of our prohibition amendment is simple and clear. It was adopted to stop production, consumption and trade in alcoholic beverages within United States territory. Not even the most rabid prohibitionist intended that the amendment should be made to apply to the high seas or to the people of other nations, not prohibitionists, traveling on the high seas. Yet the Daugherty ruling extends it to such application.

HALIFAX SHIPPING MEN DON'T EXPECT DIVERSION.

Special Dispatch to THE NEW YORK HERALD, HALIFAX, N. S., Oct. 8.—Opinion among shipping men in Halifax is divided as to the probable effect upon the commerce of this port of Attorney-General Daugherty's decision with regard to liquor on transatlantic passenger ships.

While the hope is expressed that this may mean a diversion of traffic from United States ports to Canadian, as feared by Chairman Lasker of the United States Shipping Board, it is nevertheless felt that the steamship lines sailing directly from European to American ports will be able to find a way of circumventing the ruling without recourse to the circuitous method of touching at Canadian ports for the purpose of unloading liquor in bond prior to entering the prohibition zone.

Taken in conjunction with the recent decision of the United States Government to restrict its dry activities to its own territorial waters with respect to vessels under foreign registry, the enforcement of Attorney-General Daugherty's opinion can be evaded, say local shipping men, without steamship lines being compelled to incur the additional expense of protracting their transatlantic voyage to put in at Canadian ports, pay added harbor dues and pilotage, to say nothing of purchasing such stores and fuel as would be necessary to accommodate them for the twenty-four or thirty-six hours by which the voyage under such circumstances would be lengthened.

Baltimore American—So far as the order affects American ships, the action of the Attorney-General would appear logical, convincing and legal. But difficulties of the most acute nature are very likely to result. England, for example, is most jealous of her international rights. She has a hewn of standing by her nationals. She is a stickler for English freedom of the seas, whether or not she is a stickler for the general principle. It is hard to imagine British compliance with the American attitude.

Baltimore Sun—From the purely domestic viewpoint the Daugherty "opinion" is a perfectly logical step in the chain of development initiated by the Eighteenth Amendment. Another logical step, which now no longer seems fantastic, would be to build a Chinese wall around the coast of America, admitting its gates only those firmly committed to absolute prohibition.

Boston Herald—This opinion over-

rules Chairman Lasker and his policy of putting American ships on a competitive basis with those of other nations. It makes more difficult the problem of keeping American passenger ships on the North Atlantic lanes. It serves notice on the world that the United States is in earnest in its prohibition experiment and that no call has yet been sounded for the beating of a retreat.

Providence Journal—Of course the Attorney-General and President will be subjected to criticism for the new situation, but they have taken the only position that has appeared to them to be sound, the law being what it is; and the overwhelming majority of their fellow citizens, whatever their personal inclination toward prohibition may be, must be expected to agree with them.

Chicago Tribune—The purpose of our prohibition amendment is simple and clear. It was adopted to stop production, consumption and trade in alcoholic beverages within United States territory. Not even the most rabid prohibitionist intended that the amendment should be made to apply to the high seas or to the people of other nations, not prohibitionists, traveling on the high seas. Yet the Daugherty ruling extends it to such application.

HALIFAX SHIPPING MEN DON'T EXPECT DIVERSION.

Special Dispatch to THE NEW YORK HERALD, HALIFAX, N. S., Oct. 8.—Opinion among shipping men in Halifax is divided as to the probable effect upon the commerce of this port of Attorney-General Daugherty's decision with regard to liquor on transatlantic passenger ships.

While the hope is expressed that this may mean a diversion of traffic from United States ports to Canadian, as feared by Chairman Lasker of the United States Shipping Board, it is nevertheless felt that the steamship lines sailing directly from European to American ports will be able to find a way of circumventing the ruling without recourse to the circuitous method of touching at Canadian ports for the purpose of unloading liquor in bond prior to entering the prohibition zone.

Taken in conjunction with the recent decision of the United States Government to restrict its dry activities to its own territorial waters with respect to vessels under foreign registry, the enforcement of Attorney-General Daugherty's opinion can be evaded, say local shipping men, without steamship lines being compelled to incur the additional expense of protracting their transatlantic voyage to put in at Canadian ports, pay added harbor dues and pilotage, to say nothing of purchasing such stores and fuel as would be necessary to accommodate them for the twenty-four or thirty-six hours by which the voyage under such circumstances would be lengthened.

Baltimore American—So far as the order affects American ships, the action of the Attorney-General would appear logical, convincing and legal. But difficulties of the most acute nature are very likely to result. England, for example, is most jealous of her international rights. She has a hewn of standing by her nationals. She is a stickler for English freedom of the seas, whether or not she is a stickler for the general principle. It is hard to imagine British compliance with the American attitude.

Baltimore Sun—From the purely domestic viewpoint the Daugherty "opinion" is a perfectly logical step in the chain of development initiated by the Eighteenth Amendment. Another logical step, which now no longer seems fantastic, would be to build a Chinese wall around the coast of America, admitting its gates only those firmly committed to absolute prohibition.

Boston Herald—This opinion over-

rules Chairman Lasker and his policy of putting American ships on a competitive basis with those of other nations. It makes more difficult the problem of keeping American passenger ships on the North Atlantic lanes. It serves notice on the world that the United States is in earnest in its prohibition experiment and that no call has yet been sounded for the beating of a retreat.

Providence Journal—Of course the Attorney-General and President will be subjected to criticism for the new situation, but they have taken the only position that has appeared to them to be sound, the law being what it is; and the overwhelming majority of their fellow citizens, whatever their personal inclination toward prohibition may be, must be expected to agree with them.

Chicago Tribune—The purpose of our prohibition amendment is simple and clear. It was adopted to stop production, consumption and trade in alcoholic beverages within United States territory. Not even the most rabid prohibitionist intended that the amendment should be made to apply to the high seas or to the people of other nations, not prohibitionists, traveling on the high seas. Yet the Daugherty ruling extends it to such application.

HALIFAX SHIPPING MEN DON'T EXPECT DIVERSION.

Special Dispatch to THE NEW YORK HERALD, HALIFAX, N. S., Oct. 8.—Opinion among shipping men in Halifax is divided as to the probable effect upon the commerce of this port of Attorney-General Daugherty's decision with regard to liquor on transatlantic passenger ships.

While the hope is expressed that this may mean a diversion of traffic from United States ports to Canadian, as feared by Chairman Lasker of the United States Shipping Board, it is nevertheless felt that the steamship lines sailing directly from European to American ports will be able to find a way of circumventing the ruling without recourse to the circuitous method of touching at Canadian ports for the purpose of unloading liquor in bond prior to entering the prohibition zone.

Taken in conjunction with the recent decision of the United States Government to restrict its dry activities to its own territorial waters with respect to vessels under foreign registry, the enforcement of Attorney-General Daugherty's opinion can be evaded, say local shipping men, without steamship lines being compelled to incur the additional expense of protracting their transatlantic voyage to put in at Canadian ports, pay added harbor dues and pilotage, to say nothing of purchasing such stores and fuel as would be necessary to accommodate them for the twenty-four or thirty-six hours by which the voyage under such circumstances would be lengthened.

Baltimore American—So far as the order affects American ships, the action of the Attorney-General would appear logical, convincing and legal. But difficulties of the most acute nature are very likely to result. England, for example, is most jealous of her international rights. She has a hewn of standing by her nationals. She is a stickler for English freedom of the seas, whether or not she is a stickler for the general principle. It is hard to imagine British compliance with the American attitude.

Baltimore Sun—From the purely domestic viewpoint the Daugherty "opinion" is a perfectly logical step in the chain of development initiated by the Eighteenth Amendment. Another logical step, which now no longer seems fantastic, would be to build a Chinese wall around the coast of America, admitting its gates only those firmly committed to absolute prohibition.

Boston Herald—This opinion over-

Intoxicated Man Went To Hear Judge's Talk

THOMAS HARNEY, aged 45, of 5737 Mosholu avenue, The Bronx, went to Yonkers police court yesterday, intoxicated, and fell asleep on a spectator's bench. The attention of Judge Boote was attracted when he toppled off the bench.

"Why did you visit the court in this condition?" asked the Judge.

"Oh, I come here often," replied Harney. "I like to hear you talk, and the advice you give to prisoners meets with my approval."

Judge Boote advised Harney to keep sober, after Patrolman McCormick had arrested him on a charge of intoxication. Then he suspended sentence.

rules Chairman Lasker and his policy of putting American ships on a competitive basis with those of other nations. It makes more difficult the problem of keeping American passenger ships on the North Atlantic lanes. It serves notice on the world that the United States is in earnest in its prohibition experiment and that no call has yet been sounded for the beating of a retreat.

Providence Journal—Of course the Attorney-General and President will be subjected to criticism for the new situation, but they have taken the only position that has appeared to them to be sound, the law being what it is; and the overwhelming majority of their fellow citizens, whatever their personal inclination toward prohibition may be, must be expected to agree with them.

Chicago Tribune—The purpose of our prohibition amendment is simple and clear. It was adopted to stop production, consumption and trade in alcoholic beverages within United States territory. Not even the most rabid prohibitionist intended that the amendment should be made to apply to the high seas or to the people of other nations, not prohibitionists, traveling on the high seas. Yet the Daugherty ruling extends it to such application.

HALIFAX SHIPPING MEN DON'T EXPECT DIVERSION.